DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION GENERAL SERVICES DIVISION STATE PROCUREMENT BUREAU

www.discoveringmontana.com/doa/gsd



BRIAN SCHWEITZER GOVERNOR

STATE OF MONTANA

MITCHELL BUILDING, ROOM 165 PO BOX 200135

(406) 444-2575 (406) 444-2529 FAX TTY Users-Dial 711 HELENA, MONTANA 59620-0135

OCTOBER 27, 2005

STATE OF MONTANA REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL ADDENDUM RFP NO.: RFP06-12000 TO BE OPENED: NOVEMBER 18, 2005 TITLE: ELECTRONICS GRANT MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

ADDENDUM NO. 1

To All Offerors:

Make the following changes/clarifications to the above-referenced "Request for Proposal":

- 1. Section 6.1, evaluation criteria, page 32, ability to meet supply specifications, item "P", training; change point value from "502" to "50".
- 2. Attached are written questions received in response to this RFP. These questions, along with the State's response, become an official amendment to this RFP.

All other terms of the subject "Request for Proposal" are to remain as previously stated.

Acknowledgment of Addendum:

The offeror for this solicitation must acknowledge receipt of this addendum. This page must be submitted at the time set for the proposal opening or the proposal may be disqualified from further consideration.

Robert Oliver, Contracts Officer

Section Number	Question/Answer
2.2	Q 1. The RFP inquires about support from initial implementation (September 30, 2006) for one year. The RFP states, however, that the original contract date ends on February 2, 2007. How does OPI envision Production Support occurring after the contract end date? Should a separate estimate for support from February 2007
	through September 2007 be included with the RFP response?
	A 1. Section 2.2 of the contract indicates that the contract can be renewed in one (1) year (or other) intervals, for a total period up to five (5) years. The OPI would likely utilize these contract renewals to provide on-going support and maintenance of the application. The cost would be re-negotiated on a yearly basis until the contract expires. Once the contract has expired OPI will be required to issue a new RFP.
2.2	Q 2. How does OPI envision Production Support occurring beyond September 2007? Will OPI be supporting the system and making its own enhancements?
	A 2. Section 2.2 of the contract indicates that the contract can be renewed in one (1) year (or other) intervals, for a total period up to five (5) years. The OPI would likely utilize these contract renewals to provide on-going support and maintenance of the application. However, if the contract is not renewed and enhancements are necessary or desired, the OPI would be willing to make the changes and provide any other on-going support.
3.0	Q 3. When responding to the requirements listed in section 3.0 of the RFP, how should the textual summary for each response be included? For example, should the summary occur in the same table column as the "Y/N/D" indicators?
	A 3. Please include your summary in the last column of the table labeled response/weight.
3.0	Q 4. Could you clarify the requirements response phrase "Done By Implementation?" We see this possibly meaning that the functionality does not exist at the time of proposal response but will be added by the time the implementation begins. Could it also mean that the functionality will be added to the State of Montana E-Grants Management system via the implementation/customization services? Or, would both qualify?
	A 4. "Done by Implementation," means that the functionality does not currently exist in the offeror's solution, but will be added at some point during the implementation of the product at OPI.

Section Number	Question/Answer
3.1.6	Q 5. 3.1.6. states provide standard directory information for subgrantees to be drawn from a centralized repository within the SEA. (Please see the reference to "Central" in the section titled Acronym/Terminology Definitions). Will the proposed system provide the repository or is there an existing one to be drawn from already.
	A 5. The SEA currently has a repository of the standard directory information. The information will be drawn from the data warehouse.
3.10.1	Q 6. 3.10.1 states include a system that assists subgrantees with their planning processes. For example, improvement plans, 5YCEP, Performance Indicators (such as IDEA), etc. Can you give more clarification on what this planning system will entail?
	A 6. Examples of the planning system are goals, objectives, and action steps for each grant by district and tied to the fiscal resources. Also please refer to the E-grants management business process flow chart on page 13 of the RFP for a visual as to how the planning tool relates to the budget and fundable activities. Examples of the planning system are goals, objectives, and action steps for each grant by district and tied to the fiscal resources. Also please refer to the E-grants management business process flow chart on page 13 of the RFP for a visual as to how the planning tool relates to the budget and fundable activities.
3.11.2	Q 7. 3.11.2 states allow district to save a completed applications in MS Word (.DOC) and/or Adobe (PDF) formats. What's the goal here? Are you trying to save versions of the application in the database for future reference? Or are you just looking for the ability to export the information in a doc or pdf once it's done for the user?
	A 7. The goal is to have the ability to export completed applications in DOC or PDF format for the user. It is not to save these documents in the database.
3.15	Q 8. 3.15 specifies that the vender commits to provide up to 20 reports to be specified at a later date. Will these be specified prior to the delivery date of the proposal? This information would be necessary in order to accurately provide implementation service projections.
	A 8. These reports would be negotiated and worked out between OPI and the vendor after the contract has been awarded.

Section Number	Question/Answer
3.16.1	Q 9. We are unclear about the amount / nature of training that OPI is requesting to be performed outside of Helena. Can you please clarify OPI's expectation about such sessions?
	A 9. OPI would expect advice and assistance in planning, organizing, and preparing training sessions and training materials for OPI staff and for school and county users. For OPI staff, the contractor would thoroughly explain features and functionalities to groups of OPI technical, financial, and program staff, using demonstrations, hands-on practice, and user manuals. Other segments would involve one-on-one and small group training with programmers and IT staff to familiarize them with all facets of the program and technical support. For field users, the contractor would help staff prepare presentations to teach school staff how to use all subrecipient user functions. The contractor would act in a train the trainer capacity, including attending two (2) regional field training sessions to present information and help OPI staff adopt effective training techniques they'll use in subsequent regional presentations. After implementation and initial training, the contractor would provide technical support to OPI staff by phone, email, and teleconference methods throughout the first year following initial installation.
3.3.2	Q 10. 3.3.2 states the web forms and images must fully load within 20 seconds on a workstation with a connection as slow as 28.8 KB. All system components must be designed to adequately store and quickly deliver information to end-users. The system must efficiently handle peak workloads and maintain a high level of responsiveness. The requirement should be rephrased to say copy text & graphics sizes must be smaller than 64k on web forms pages. That's how much information can be transmitted in 20 seconds at 28.8 Kbps. This is also a possibly an impossible requirement if the form is large with many fields.
	A 10. There really isn't a question here. However, I would like to point to the Gartner Group and other studies that have been done on web response time that state "there is no industry standard specification for the load time of a web page, only competitive benchmarks." Defining performance requirements is important, and eight (8)seconds is a good starting point. A study done by the Nielsen Group in 1999 states that "ten (10) seconds is an unacceptable response time." The OPI feels the requirement of twenty (20) seconds is not unreasonable based on this information.
3.3.3	Q 11. Is it OPI's intention to obtain a system that contains tools that allow OPI users to generate web forms that comprise Grant Applications, for completion by LEA's?
	A 11. Yes.

Section Number	Question/Answer
3.4	Q 12. It is stated that SQL-Server must be used as the database. Within the link in section 2.6 to the State of Montana Information Technology Environment, it states that Oracle should be used. Please confirm that where the RFP differs from IT standards of any document <i>referenced</i> by this RFP, that text within the RFP shall govern.
	A 12. While Oracle is accepted as the State of Montana standard for databases, SQL is also an accepted standard and is the OPI enterprise database. Where standards are concerned the RFP takes precedence over referenced documents.
3.4	Q 13. Aside from SQL Server and IIS, are there technical requirements of the system. For example, should it be ASP/COM based, .Net based, C# based.
	A 13. The OPI prefers that the application be .NET based, however, there are no requirements other than the database and web server requirements listed in the RFP.
3.5.3	Q 14. 3.5.3 states all modifications and additions to the database will be time-and date-stamped, and create an audit trail. The audit trail information may include the following:
	 Last subgrantee and user ID to edit a record. Date and time of record creation.
	 Date and time of fecord creation. Date and time of last record update.
	 Fields that were changed.
	Optional comments for person updating, i.e., reason for change.
	Can you estimate the number of modifications & additions that will be done in a time period, such as per month?
	A 14. Most of the modifications will be made during the approval process of an application. The number of modifications or additions is difficult to estimate and could vary greatly from application to applications and how thorough an applicant completes their application the first time around. There will be approximately forty (40) grants that will be included in the E-grants system.

Section Number	Question/Answer
3.5.6	 Q 15. 3.5.6 states all secured web services may be required to integrate with ePass Montana, the State's Internet federated ID service. The ePass Montana service is based on SAML 1.1 using SourceID as a code base. Development toolkits are available for PERL, PHP, JAVA, ASP and .NET. Where can we get information on ePass Montana? A 15. For information on ePass Montana you can visit the federal government's e-authentication initiative website at: http://www.cio.gov/eauthentication/. The State of Montana is following the federal government's requirements
	in implementing this single-login solution. Additional information can be found on the SourceID website at: http://www.sourceid.org/index.html. The base code used for ePass Montana is SourceID.
3.8.1	 Q 16. 3.8.1 states import information from other external programs (such as Excel, MS Access, etc.) to include at least potential subgrantees, allocation amounts, MOE, and final or net allocations. Can you give more clarification on this? Is this a simple case of we have a few instances where some of our information will be added/updated from an external spreadsheet or database? Or are you looking for a much larger magic bullet kind of importing interface that would need training just to learn how to use the importer that could map any external entity to any system database entity? A 16. The main intention of this requirement is to allow for the import of the allocations and MOE for each
	subgrantee. This could be performed for both preliminary and final (net) allocations for a given grant. Approximately all forty (40) grants that will be utilizing the E-grants system will have external programs that someone will be importing the data into the E-grants system. Training may be required depending on the complexity of the process used.
4.1.1	Q 17. 4.1.1 requires 4 references of which at least 1 must be a state E-grants management system. This is a pass/fail requirement. We have many very large clients and are also in a pre-solicitation stage with the Federal Department of Education. However, we do not have a state level client. May we have an exception to this requirement? We would be happy to provide more than 4 references if this would somehow compensate for the exception.
	A 17. No exceptions will be granted for this requirement. The OPI wishes to have a vendor who has implemented at least one (1) state level E-grants management system.
4.1.2.	Q 18. For the purposes of submitting resumes, who does OPI define as key personnel?
	A 18. Key personnel are the bidders' project manager(s), and any people who will be directly involved with OPI staff in the installation, implementation, training, and technical assistance functions.

Section Number	Question/Answer
6.1	Q 19. The point values for "Ability to Meet Supply Specifications" do not sum to 1250. It appears the intent was to
	make Training (3.16 P) worth 50 points and not 502. Please verify.
	A 19. This was a typo and has been changed to fifty (50) points through this addendum.
General	Q 20. Does the solution have to be COTS or can it be a complete custom solution?
	A 20. There is no specific requirement for a COTS solution as long as the solution meets all of the requirements specified in section 3 of the RFP and has met the offeror qualifications stated in section 4 of the RFP. Specifically, refer to section 4.1.1, which states the offeror must have been the prime contractor for at least one state level E-grants management system. Also, please note that the top five (5) offerors who achieve 70% or higher will be asked to demonstrate specific items that are referenced in section 3 of the RFP.
General	Q 21. Is the state looking for an existing Grants management system? Or will it accept a bid for developing one form scratch?
	A 21. Please see the answer to question 20 above.
General	Q 22. Which grants listed in OPI's State and Federal Grants Handbook (referred to as "handbook" from this point
	forward) is OPI expecting to be made available for entry and submission by September 30, 2006?
	A 22. DEA and the programs in the Consolidated Application are OPI's first priority to make available for entry and submission.
General	Q 23. If any of the grants to be available for entry and submission by September 30, 2006 are those listed in the handbook as Consolidated Application grants, is OPI expecting there to be a data conversion effort to include the grant information that Montana's school districts will already have completed?
	A 23. The OPI does not expect any data conversion efforts to take place and feel it would be best to start using the E-grants program beginning with the new grant year.
General	Q 24. From the calendar in the handbook, the Consolidated Application is made available to school districts in April each year. Is the September 30 approval due date for the school districts or for OPI?
	A 24. The way the September 30 approval date is presented in the calendar portion of the grants handbook means that September 30 is the last day for OPI to finish approving projects. However, not all of the programs have been able to adhere to this deadline every year due to missing information from districts.

Section Number	Question/Answer
General	Q 25. Does OPI have a preference for what development toolkit (.NET, ASP, etc.) is used for the new system?
	A 25NET is preferable; however, any toolkit is acceptable so long as the application meets the technical requirements (IIS, SQL Server).